

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

DATE MAILED: 05/18/2005

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/664,729	09/18/2003	Arihiro Takeda	1117.68339	5616
7590 05/18/2005			EXAMINER	
Patrick G. Burns, Esq.			DUONG, THOI V	
GREER, BUR	NS & CRAIN, LTD.			
Suite 2500			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
300 South Wacker Dr.			2871	
Chicago II. 6	50606			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/664,729	TAKEDA ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Thoi V. Duong	2871	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address -THE REPLY FILED 09 May 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

- 1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:
 - a) The period for reply expires <u>03</u> months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
 - b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

<u>NOTICE OF APPEAU</u>	L
-------------------------	---

2. [The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date
	of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
	Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).	•
<u>AMENDMENTS</u>	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because	е
(a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);	

- (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
 (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
- (d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

- 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
- 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
- 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
- 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: ____.
Claim(s) objected to:

Claim(s) objected to: _____ Claim(s) rejected: <u>27-31</u>.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

- 8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will <u>not</u> be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
- 9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
- 10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

- 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

 <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u>
- 12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s).

13. Other: ____.

TARIFUR R. CHOWDHURY

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments are not persuasive. Applicant argued that nowhere does Song teach that the protrusion pattern 170 is anything other than a single, continuous shape; furthermore, neither Fig. 17 nor Fig. 18 show any break in the continuous structure of the protrusion pattern 170. The Examiner disagrees because Applicant claims in claim 27 that the second orientation control element is constituted by an assembly of plural orientation control elements; Applicant does not claim that the second orientation control element is a plurality of separate, distinct elements. Moreover, as shown in Fig. 19B, which is a section view I-I' of Fig. 19A, and in Fig. 20B, which is a sectional view I-I' of Fig. 20A, the auxiliary bank 43 (or the second orientation control element) of the present invention is a single, continuous structure without a break. Back to Song, Figs. 17 and 18 of Song show four domains obtained by the apertures 250 and the protrusion 170 which has plural orientation control elements (4 ea.) connected together (col. 11, lines 3-6). Accordingly, the protrusion 170 is constituted by an assembly of plural orientation control elements. Thus a prima facie of anticipation has been established against claim 27 of the present invention. Re claim 28, Figs. 17 and 18 of Song clearly shows that the protrusion 170 (the second orientation control element) is formed to extend in an outer direction from the aperture 250 (the first orientation control element) which is adjacent to the protrusion 170. Finally, Applicant required the Examiner to interpret the claims according to the specification of the application; however, according to MPEP 2111, "reading a claim in light of the specification, to thereby interpret limitations explicitly recited in the claim, is a quite different thing from "reading limitations of the specification into a claim," thereby narrow the scope of the claim by implicitly adding disclosed limitations which have no express basis in the claim." Therefore, the claims of the present invention must be given their broadest reasonable interpretation.